

# MASON COUNTY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMISSION

**Minutes**  
**May 18, 2009**

(Note audio tape (#2) dated May 18, 2009  
counter (#) for exact details of discussion)

*(This document is not intended to be a verbatim transcript)*

=====

## **1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm by Chair Dennis Pickard.

## **2. ROLL CALL**

**Members Present:** Bill Dewey, Tim Wing, Dennis Pickard, Diane Edgin, Debbie Jacobs, and Don LeMaster. Jim Reece was excused.

**Staff Present:** Barbara Adkins, Kell McAboy, and Susie Ellingson.

## **3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes from the January 26, 2009 and March 16, 2009 meetings were approved as presented with the following requested changes:

March 16, 2009:

On page 9 under (#3700) it should read: 'Bill Dewey stated' ...

On page 9 under (#3700) it should read: 'Bruce Wulkan' ...

On page 9 under (#0125) it should read: 'You have a pretty elaborate program' ...

Change headers from '2008' to '2009' on both meeting minutes.

## **4. NEW BUSINESS**

(#0130) Barbara Adkins, Department of Community Development, opened the public hearing on the proposed

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 18, 2009

development regulations for the Shelton Urban Growth Area. For the benefit for those who were not in attendance at the workshop last month, Mason County adopted Shelton's Urban Growth Area Sub-Area Plan in January of 2008. State code requires that we also adopt development regulations that are consistent with and implement it's Comprehensive Plan. The City of Shelton received a grant from CTED and they've been working with Mason County and a private consultant, along with an advisory group, to draft the proposed development regulations. They have been out for public review since early April, we had a workshop on April 20<sup>th</sup>. Several comments were received and incorporated into a draft before you tonight in a strike-through version. At that time, Jean Carr, consultant from Shea, Carr, and Jewell, went through each one of the chapters and we had discussions about each of them. She is back here tonight to discuss those changes and take public testimony. She inquired if there were any questions.

(#0195) Bill Dewey stated he thinks it would be appropriate to go through the edits one by one for members of the public.

(#0215) Jean Carr noted there were no changes in the Neighborhood Residential or Mixed Use Districts. In General Commercial, Item 6 under .020 now reads 'Business and professional offices'. We added 'Grocery Stores' as an outright permitted use. We added 'Medical and dental offices'. We also added 'Self storage facilities', 'Social services', and 'Veterinary clinics'. We added 'Similar or related uses permitted', which makes it consistent with some of the other chapters. Under Accessory uses, we struck 'air pollution control authority' and added 'Olympic Region Clean Air Authority (ORCAA)'. Under Maximum height it now reads 'Zone with a lower height restriction'... In Commercial Industrial in the Intent section we added clarifying that the language about access to roads is not intended to restrict access to local roads from private parcels. Under Permitted Uses, we added 'and sales' to D. We struck F and M. We added 'data centers and self storage facilities' Under Airport Industrial the only change we made was we added 'Development may be further restricted by airport overlay zoning where applicable'. Under Industrial District in Permitted Uses we added the words 'with jurisdiction over the activity'. Under Permitted uses we struck out 'data centers'. Added 'junkyards', 'car wreckage' 'salvage' 'enameling' and 'mineral extraction'. We struck out 'Minimum on B under Minimum site requirements. Under Public Institutional we moved the residential uses as incidental to the Accessory Uses category. We added a Maximum Height section which reads 'Maximum height in the Public Institutional district shall be as follows: 45 feet, except when adjoining a more restrictive use district, in which case any structure located within 100 feet of the more restrictive zone shall have a maximum height as imposed by the more restrictive district. Height may be further restricted by airport overlay zoning, where applicable. Deviation from this standard will be processed as a special use permit'. Under Landscaping and Screening added under Continuance 'When an existing site is improved or redeveloped, the County may allow the applicant to pay a fee in lieu as established by the BOCC for use in the enhancement of public properties, such as wetlands or parks, rather than provide landscaping improvements at current standards'. Under the Parking Standards no changes were made.

(#0515) Bill Dewey noted on page 5 of the Parking Construction Standards he would like to see something added for LID standards.

(#0550) Barbara Adkins stated Allyn and Belfair were included as part of a GMA compliance issue with regards to LID's. Shelton was not part of that, but that is something we can put in there to incorporate the Shelton UGA as being an area that we would apply those LID's to as well.

(#0625) Dennis Pickard inquired about the zones with the maximum height standards in them and stated the language is relatively inconsistent between the two. He noted he is more inclined to like the language that's in the Public Institutional District. With the exception of the less intense language.

(#0665) Bill Dewey talked about the Mixed Use Low Intensity District with regards to adding self storage units there as a permitted use.

(#0685) Jean Carr stated we added that in the General Commercial District.

(#0700) Miscellaneous discussion about self storage units.

(#0750) Jean Carr noted we didn't strike it out under Prohibited Uses.

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 18, 2009

(#0775) Bill Dewey also noted under General Commercial veterinary clinics are allowed but not kennels.

(#0785) Barbara Adkins stated under Prohibited Uses we can add after 'Kennels' the language 'except where associated with veterinary clinics'.

(#0825) Dennis Pickard opened up the public testimony portion of the hearing.

(#0845) Gary Minor of Island Lake Drive stated he received no notice of the workshop, but only the hearing.

(#0865) Barbara Adkins stated there were postcards sent out to all property owners in the Shelton UGA for both the workshop and the public hearing.

(#0880) Kell McAboy added the Planning Department pulled the Assessor records for addresses for all the properties within the UGA. We did send out pink postcards for the workshop, which some were returned because of bad addresses. When we corrected those, they were sent out as red postcards for the public hearing. Our addresses were only as good as our county Assessor records. We apologize for that, but we did our best effort. We do have a list of the addresses in our office if you would like to review them.

(#0900) Gary Minor stated the City of Shelton has 35 foot wide lots, but those were from old plats that were created 60 or 70 years ago. As a general statement, where I live, most of our lots are 200 feet long. If you have 35 foot wide residential lots it would be horrendous. He inquired if there is a way to keep the minimum width at 50 feet. With the zoning requirements, are design standards going to be implemented with it? He explained about the City of Shelton's regulations require curb, sidewalk and gutter with any improvement.

(#1000) Kell McAboy explained the advisory group did not get to the design standards so the county, at this time, will not be adopting any design standards.

(#1050) Dave Salzer, Assistant Fire Chief for Mason County Fire District #5, and I'm also the City of Shelton Fire Marshall. He explained he has a document that he would like to present by reading it into the record. The issue in this document is the issue of fire protection in the UGA. We recently received a submittal from an applicant for a development in what is now an area that is unzoned. It has no designation so it allows any kind of development. When Mason County adopts the proposed zoning designations, the applicants site will be zoned residential, although it will be by definition be industrial; it is a huge warehouse complex. During that meeting, the applicant made reference that he planned to provide fire flow to the site and he gave us the terms of the flow and storage. That was 750 gpm with a storage capacity of 90,000 gallons. Part of our review process when a new development comes to the city is to do a fire flow analysis. We have a process to determine how much water it will take to fight a fire in a building or development like this. Our fire flow analysis for this particular site was 2,300 gpm. That's consistent with an industrial amount of fire flow. The proposed water system for the applicant's project will conform to the city's standards for residential fire protection. It's exactly half of what would be required for a facility like that if the area were rezoned, or because it is an industrial use. The applicant explained he did want to hook up to the city's water system but the city policy has been if you take our water, you take our sewer as well. He could afford the water but not the sewer. We have some similar issues in play right now on Johns Prairie Road in the site that is part of your deliberations here. Atlas Pellet Plant built a pellet plant a couple of years ago and they established a minimum fire flow value is equivalent to what would be an industrial fire flow given the city's designation of that land. PUD # 3 has announced a plan to build a campus further out Johns Prairie Road. They also plan to put in their own water system. We have had comments from a private developer about developing a business park along Johns Prairie Road in the general area of the PUD project, and that project would also involve a private water system. All three of these developments would be by definition of the city's standards as industrial uses. The main concern to Fire District #5, and also the city, are several. In addition to compromising fire protection these small independent water systems general provide a minimum flow rate and storage capacity, which can be a liability to the overall insurance grading of a municipal system. As proprietary designs, these small systems often do not consider the design and performance requirements of municipal systems to which they may be connected at a future time. When these small systems are connected to a municipal system, the municipal system often suffers in terms of reliability, capacity and performance. When a municipal system connect to a small independent system, maintenance and

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 18, 2009

improvements to the independent system become the responsibility of the municipal system. Although small independent systems for fire protection can be designed and installed to NFPA standards, a critical flow inherent in systems that designed to provide a minimum amount of storage capacity and flow is that there is a finite amount of water available in a fixed storage tank, which leaves little or no reserve for extended operations. A public water system, like the City of Shelton system, has extensive redundant capacity. That resource was obvious in the fire ground operations at the Timber Bowl fire. Over a 16-hour period, we used an estimated 500,000 gallons of water to control and finally extinguish that fire. Mason County Fire District #5 requests that you consider the following issues as you work through finalizing zoning regulations for the Shelton UGA: 1) All new proprietary water systems for fire protection in the Shelton UGA should be installed to the City of Shelton Water System Comprehensive Plan standards, and 2) Approval of all new proprietary water systems for fire protection in the Shelton UGA should be conditioned to be connected to the City of Shelton Water System when that systems serves the site of the proprietary water system.

(#1335) Don LeMaster inquired about the second issue.

(#1340) Dave Salzer explained when that area is annexed into the UGA, whenever that happens, that those systems be connected to the municipal water system. Atlas Pellets was aware of that. The other projects are still on paper and in some cases we haven't made the specific deliberation on those. I sit on both sides of the review process for these because I represent FD #5 as well as the city. At the point which they are annexed into the city, they need to know they're annexing assets and not liabilities in terms of the quality of the system.

(#1450) Matt Matayoshi of the Economic Development Council spoke next. I had the opportunity to be involved in this planning process and working with staff, consultants, and the committee. What you have in front of you is a very good document, but one piece we spent quite a bit of time on is the Landscaping and Screening standards. In looking at that and considering what is there for industrial, is my concern. Anything fronting a road would be required to have a 15 foot buffer. Requirements for stormwater, easements, setbacks from property lines, there are a number of requirements that then limit the ability of a developer or company to build out a site. That 15 foot buffer could make it very difficult or impossible to develop a site. There are some alternatives to this. There's either no buffer requirements or to put in something like 15 feet. I would advocate you to consider an option of having a performance based landscaping plan. The Civic Center has approximately 5 feet of landscaping buffer, but have done an excellent job of planting vegetation that buffers the facility. In considering the Industrial District itself, data centers were excluded. Data centers can be anywhere from one rack of servers to 150,000 sq feet of servers. The PUD operates a data center within the City of Shelton limits and you wouldn't even know it exists. I feel it is something that can exist in an industrial zone. Lastly, the Commercial Industrial District had a change which excludes 'enameling or metal coating, galvanizing, electroplating'. Enameling or metal coating is actually more common and accessible to folks who can do it in their own garage. It might be more appropriate as an accessory use rather than an exclusive use. That would address that issue.

(#1670) Bob Stone stated he moved here to be in the county, not in the city. Just because somebody decided taking over an area would help the city, is wrong. We weren't asked about it. I live just the other side of McEwan Prairie and we have no need for city services. For \$40.00 a month, I can have a good road, good water and take care of my garbage. You can't get that in the city. According to what I've read, it's up to the BOCC and City Commissioners to approve this, and I'm going back to October of 1995 when the people of Walker Park said 'no', and they were dropped off it. It proves the citizen does have a choice of where they want to live.

(#1760) Dick Doak stated he moved to Rhododendron Place as he wanted to be in the country. I'm not in the city. We voted down commercial / industrial in that area. Right now I've got a pellet factory two blocks from my front door putting out steam and sawdust. We're pretty unhappy about it.

(#1795) Robert Woodward stated the way the city runs the town and treat the kids here, I've got nothing for them. This town has nothing for the people. I want to stay in the county where I'm at.

(#1850) Jay Hupp of the Port of Shelton commented there's an error on the Airport Industrial District. As we go to paragraph .030, it states 'All uses shall act in accordance with Chapter IV of the Sanderson Field Master

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 18, 2009

Plan'. That should read 'Chapter IV of the Port of Shelton Comprehensive Plan'. I'd like to point out the comments I made at the workshop, the maps that are available are not correct as far as the reality of existing properties in the UGA. An piece that is designated Commercial/Industrial is actually part of the airport property and should be designated Airport/Industrial. The property east of Highway 101 is a 40-acre section that belongs to the Port and part of it is marked public and part of it marked Industrial. It should all be part of the Airport/Industrial property. The State Patrol Academy is marked as Industrial, and I don't think a state patrol academy should be industrial. So a number of things on the map are not correct, and if it goes forward, the county stands in great jeopardy of being called to task for forwarding incorrect maps.

(#1965) Don LeMaster inquired about the airport overlay.

(#1975) Jay Hupp explained the airport overlay is simply consideration for the air use.

(#2035) Dennis Pickard closed the public testimony portion of the hearing.

(#2150) Barbara Adkins added some comments regarding Jay Hupp's comments. She explained the future land use map that we adopted as part of the sub-area plan had errors on it, and they were brought to our attention. In order to fix them, we're doing the Comp Plan update in October. We will meet with Jay and Matt to go over all the discrepancies.

(#2200) Kell McAboy stated by making corrections on the zoning map now, we're out of compliance. In October when we have to several other zoning updates, we'll change the county's future land use map, and make the same change to the Shelton UGA's future land use map. The map needs to be adopted along with the zoning regulations, which reflects the future land use map as adopted in the Comp Plan. Then your development regulations match your Comp Plan.

(#2400) Bill Dewey stated he is uncomfortable adopting development regulations when there isn't an accurate site a person can go to and find out how their property is zoned.

(#2425) Barbara Adkins reiterated that there are only a couple of changes, and for the most part, the map is accurate.

(#2435) Debbie Jacobs stated her concern is we're adopting a map that is incorrect in two or three areas, and we're relying on the system to make sure that that map, when the land use Comp Plan comes up, that this one gets changed at the same time. It's difficult to approve something that we know has errors on it.

(#2455) Kell McAboy stated she will make a clarification that it's not incorrect. It is the Port's feeling that there were some properties, that on the future land use map, were misrepresented. We do agree with that, which is why we would adopt this map and then agree to correct it and subsequently adopt a new zoning map. We do have to follow strict state guidelines as far as when you can change your future land use map.

(#2500) Don LeMaster inquired if it can be adopted with a caveat, and Kell stated they could do that.

(#2540) Discussion ensued regarding Mr. Salzer's comments on fire protection.

(#2700) Barbara Adkins explained those comments would be better addressed when we have the public hearing on the inter-local government agreement where they make the determination of city and county water supply. I will submit his comments to the BOCC for that public hearing.

(#2750) Discussion regarding Mr. Matayoshi's comments on performance landscaping, and putting data centers back into industrial. Also, enameling and metal coating as a accessory use in the Commercial / Industrial. The PAC agreed those sounded like good suggestions.

(#2800) Jean Carr talked about performance based landscaping as it relates to street frontages. The regulations set up some different options depending on what is trying to be done. The specific 15 foot requirement is where you're buffering from a less intensive land use. There is also some additional language for the county to make adjustments on specific situations where the strict interpretation of the code might stop

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 18, 2009

someone from being able to develop the property.

(#2900) Miscellaneous discussion on landscaping regulations and buffering.

(#3050) Matt Matayoshi noted that only the Johns Prairie corridor will really be affected. He noted he does agree there needs to be significant buffering between Industrial and Residential. He talked about the 6 foot high fence and 15 foot landscaping buffer, and maybe an alternative would be to add a berm as that helps with sound noise abatement. Then the other issue is landscaping on the road frontage, which is 10 feet.

(#3400) Dennis Pickard noted there are already options being discussed used in single or combination that there could be performance bonuses gained. The 10 foot isn't necessarily a requirement, as there is the option for a berm. He also noted under .090, he would be more comfortable with slightly broader verbiage in terms of the site conditions.

(#3690) Jason Dose of the City of Shelton stated the reason defining a minimum standard for width is to produce a viable planned community. You need to consider at full growth of landscaping the roots like to spread. You start squeezing that down you end up with unhealthy, hard to manage vegetation. The intent of appropriately designed landscaping is to have enough room for full growth of the plan. As a planner and a resident, I would caution having too broad a caveat. It's the concept of a visual corridor along an industrial area was to have more of an emphasis between incompatible uses and along the main corridors.

(#0040) Dennis Pickard noted under .090, 'E' and 'F' should be less limiting in regards to site specific, which would leave some flexibility.

(#0100) Jean Carr offered language which would include 'If site conditions prevent reasonable use of the property, then the county can adjust those width requirements with alternative landscaping'.

(#0200) Miscellaneous discussion, and the PAC noted that would be reasonable to add. The PAC also agreed to change the minimum lot width to 50 feet, and 45 feet with an alley access.

(#0400) Bill Dewey made a motion the PAC adopts the Shelton UGA development regulations as proposed with the following amendments: 1) allowing data centers back into Industrial; 2) adding enameling or metal coating back into Commercial / Industrial as an accessory use; 3) changing lot widths in Neighborhood Residential with alleys to 45 feet, and without alleys to 50 feet; 4) acknowledging that there are some map amendments that need to be resolved with the Comp Plan amendments this fall; 5) adding the landscaping language; 6) adding 'except where associated with veterinary clinics' after 'Kennels'; and 7) maximum height paragraph being consistent under Public Institutional. The motion was seconded, and passed.

(#0660) Barbara Adkins opened the public hearing on the Belfair UGA zoning regulations Festival Retail District. We received a request for a text amendment from QFC, and their representatives are here tonight to answer any of your questions. You were briefed on this a while ago on how we got to this point. The applicants have decided to pursue a text amendment and have submitted to you, along with my staff report, their narrative and justification, along with maps. The only difference between the last time we spoke and this time is when I received their request. There were actually two amendments made to the code. They include the addition of 17.23.030(8) - gasoline retail sales in association with grocery stores, and 17.23.110 - Festival Retail purpose to read ...The district encourages pedestrian-oriented uses such as retail trade uses (excluding non-accessory auto-oriented uses), eating and drinking places, hotels and motels, personal service uses, civic and educational uses, and special events (including a farmers' market) ... We have a letter from Brian Peterson that was emailed for you to review.

(#0755) Dennis Pickard noted there was no staff recommendation in the staff report.

(#0765) Barbara Adkins responded that is correct. We're just asking you to consider the application and make a recommendation based on your evaluation.

(#0770) Bill Dewey noted the staff report didn't include a discussion about the PAC's recommendation to the BOCC. It was referenced in the narrative and justification. In reading the staff report, it didn't include our

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 18, 2009

recommendation that they direct staff to prepare a recommendation and forward it on. The existence of that request wasn't in the staff report and in the interest of keeping the record accurate, we need to make that staff report accurate.

(#0835) Barbara Adkins noted she could make that correction.

(#0840) Dennis Pickard opened up the public comment portion of the hearing.

(#0845) Mike Shunk, Director of Real Estate for QFC, stated we're here before you tonight seeking approval for a text amendment to the Belfair UGA zoning code to allow this fueling project to proceed. We talked historically about the fact that this service feature of having a gasoline facility is a service and convenience factor that today's consumers very much expect and want in their shopping experience. This is something that happens all across the country, and certainly here in the greater Puget Sound area. We do have four fueling facilities that QFC operates. We are not the only operator that operates in this manner. Safeway, Albertsons, Fred Meyer, Costco, Walmart, all recognize this need for consumers. We believe Belfair is one of those communities that would benefit by having this service for our customers. Before we entered into this process we studied the market area, recognizing the fact that there are existing operators in the community. Even with those existing operators, we feel there is still a need for this service for QFC to develop this project. It would be a 24-hour operation staffed during part of the day, and payments would be available 24-hours a day, 7 days a week through automated systems. I do appreciate your time and consideration of this project tonight.

(#0950) Chris Ferko, with Barghausen Consulting Engineers, stated we are QFC's civil engineer consultant. Adaptability - with regard to the fact that codes do not exist in a vacuum; they do need to be updated from time to time. Change - the world we live in today is different than in 2004. Scope of the amendment is minor. Principles of the Belfair UGA remain the same even with this amendment. Investment - the importance of investment in communities. In regard to adaptability, this process that we're going through exists for the very purpose of allowing a commission such as yourself to consider updates based upon our change and wealth. Before 2004, when this code was originally adopted, this grocery store was opened in 1980 as Market Foods, then Stock Market, and finally QFC. It wasn't until recently that QFC realized that there was a definite demand for the service. In order to be competitive, that is something that QFC is introducing at its stores. In regard to the scope, the amendment we're proposing is small. It's basically a discussion of accessory uses; not the primary use. QFC is both an auto-oriented and a pedestrian oriented use, as all grocery uses are. That's not going to change by approving this amendment. The grocery store will still be the primary use. When we speak of adding a fuel center to the QFC store, the parking area is an auto-oriented area for the store. Changing it to a fuel center is basically an apples to apples change. It doesn't really change the use of land. We're not proposing to delete any sections of the code. We're making a wholesale change to it. The project is still going to have to meet the county special standards of the Belfair UGA, including the design guidelines. Those guidelines include special requirements for pedestrian orientation, architectural lighting, and signs. The safeguards are already in place to ensure excellence of design. With regard to investment, this amendment allows a business to invest in itself; to remain competitive. This should raise property values; not reduce them. It also improves the quality of improvements in the area via the use of best available technology, best utility infrastructure, best structural design.

(#1235) Ken VanBuskirk of Belfair testified next. He stated he lives a half mile from the Festival Retail zone. Ken stated he was a member of the Belfair Sub-Area Planning Committee and worked very hard to get the critical aquifer recharge area recognized in the Sub-Area Plan. I have come forward in the past with concerns regarding the critical aquifer recharge area and I'd like to offer these comments for the record. The critical aquifer recharge area lies both inside the Belfair UGA and up the Union River Valley into Kitsap County. It is a Class II, highly susceptible, which by definition means that if a potential contaminant enters the underground water source it can be expected to travel 1 mile in a time frame of greater than six months and up to a year. The depth to water in some places is very shallow, as is the case with most of the former and proposed fueling facilities in the downtown core of the UGA. Unfortunately there are two unintended consequences to the ground water resources of sewerage the UGA and the resultant urban development. One is the increase in impervious surface reducing the volume of precipitation available to recharge groundwater, and secondly, development may introduce pollutants into the groundwater system. Mason

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 18, 2009

County has several policies intended to mitigate impacts to the critical aquifer recharge area. One policy, Chapter 8.52.120, focuses on identifying and regulating land uses that could have a potential significant impact on our groundwater. As part of this policy, the county is supposed to maintain a database identifying all pre-existing prohibited uses and uses requiring a permit. Several months ago I did a public records request of the county and this database doesn't exist. There are quite a few of these uses that were grandfathered and/or forgotten when the Sub-Area Plan and this policy were adopted. There are several former and current gas stations in the UGA that have had and are continuing to have environmental issues. There was a gas station and engine repair shop at this particular site being considered. I would like to ask that the PAC carefully consider any applications for permits in the critical aquifer recharge area both inside and outside the UGA until such time as a database can be developed and used for guidance. I was quite surprised to find out that while DOE does list some of these permitted sites, it doesn't have Mason County's CARA information and I think it's time they do. Regardless whether this commission decides to go with recommending a text amendment or a rezone, consider ensuring that the database is maintained and any potential impacts to the CARA be mitigated using state of the art equipment and technology, such as these folks propose. In the case of gas stations, triple walled storage tanks and redundant leak detection alarm systems. I'm sure if QFC put a fueling station in there it will be the top of the line, but I think it's our responsibility and the county's responsibility to establish some sort of a database so we won't have problems in the future.

(#1430) Chris Ferko stated QFC will install the latest state of the art facility. QFC operates 1500 gas stations across the US. They go above and beyond what the regulatory agencies require. A project like this would have to go through a SEPA review with staff. Comments would be reviewed to analyze the CARA issue. Ultimately the safety of the community is not something anybody wants to dispute.

(#1145) Dennis Pickard closed the public comment portion of the hearing.

(#1175) Bill Dewey inquired about the impervious surface in the CARA. It sounds like this is going into a portion of the parking lot paved area. Bill Dewey inquired that it used to have a gas station there in the past.

(#1500) Ken VanBuskirk explained that 30 or 40 years ago there was a service station with small engine repair there on that corner.

(#1525) Bill Dewey noted environmental mitigation could be a problem when those sites are transitioned.

(#1545) Ken VanBuskirk stated when he first saw the environmental firm doing the test holes down there at QFC I asked the driller what he found and he said they hit water at 6 to 8 feet.

(#1555) Bill Dewey stated he is inclined to recommend accepting this text amendment, but I'm also inclined to try to include some sort of guidance to the county to develop the database that Ken has brought to our attention that we're lacking.

(#1565) Don LeMaster stated he's not sure that's appropriate to add that onto this action. I tend to agree with you as far as amending the text, but for us to add additional language in there that's not directly related is not appropriate.

(#1585) Bill Dewey stated we could do a motion for the text amendment, and then add that the BOCC consider Mr. VanBuskirk's concerns about a database that should exist.

(#1600) PAC was in agreement with that statement.

(#1610) Don LeMaster made a motion to approve the request for the text amendment as written.

(#1625) Diane Edgin wished to acknowledge the people that did write and put a lot of effort into the Belfair Plan that we noted their concerns, and that as stated businesses have to evolve to stay viable. If they can't then eventually you're going to lose them.

(#1640) Bill Dewey stated he agrees that should be part of the motion, as well as other PAC members. The market evolves, and about the same time they were adopting the Belfair Plan was when the market was

## Planning Advisory Commission Minutes, May 18, 2009

shifting and gas stations were going in with the grocery stores. As I've considered it, it actually does seem like it's compatible with the Festival Retail.

(#1665) Dennis Pickard also noted it's not altering an existing pedestrian oriented use to a non-pedestrian oriented use. The proposed use isn't necessarily the same sort of use that was envisioned by the Plan. Unfortunately, there was already a use there that wasn't necessarily the specific type of use that was envisioned by the Plan.

(#1725) Bill Dewey inquired if the word 'non-accessory', and if another word might be more proper.

(#1800) Miscellaneous discussion. It was decided by the PAC to might better read as the following: 'Excluding auto oriented uses other than accessory auto oriented uses'.

(#1875) The motion was seconded, a vote was taken, and the motion passed.

Meeting adjourned.